



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Ch

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/645,903	08/25/2000	Li Li	3361.2US (97-663.2)	6825
24247	7590	06/08/2005	EXAMINER	
TRASK BRITT P.O. BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110			GUERRERO, MARIA F	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2822

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/645,903	LI, LI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Maria Guerrero	2822	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6, 8 and 9 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-9 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to Request for reconsideration filed March 30, 2005.

Status of Claims

2. Claim 7 is canceled. Claims 1-6 and 8-9 are pending.

Terminal Disclaimer

3. The terminal disclaimer filed on March 30, 2005 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of US patent No. 6,747,359 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jin et al. (U.S. 5,883,001) in view of Wilson et al. (U.S. 4,943,539).

Jin et al. teaches a contact opening in a dielectric layer extending from an upper surface of the dielectric layer to a substantially damage free metal-containing conductive pad having substantially parallel (residue-free) sidewalls (Fig. 8, col. 7, lines 29-31, 45-49). Jin et al. teaches a contact opening in a dielectric layer and a barrier

layer, the semiconductor substrate having a substantially damage free metal-containing conductive pad under the dielectric layer and the barrier layer. Jin et al. also shows the residues being removed from the contact opening (residues free) (Fig. 8, col. 2, lines 55-60, col. 7, lines 45-49). In addition, Jin et al. teaches employing a fluorine-containing compound (col. 7, lines 49-50).

Regarding the limitations “the metal-containing conductive pad substantially free of charging damage”; Jin et al. teaches that no oxide residue remains on the pads. Jin et al. also teaches limiting the dry etch time to avoid the charging damage (Fig. 8, col. 2, lines 55-65, col. 7, lines 45-62, col. 8, lines 25-30, col. 10, lines 5-12). Therefore, the metal-containing conductive pad taught by Jin et al. is substantially free of charging damage.

Regarding the limitations “a metal polymer residue-free and oxide polymer residue free contact”; Jin et al. teaches the contact opening being residues free (Fig. 8, col. 2, lines 55-60, col. 7, lines 45-49). Therefore, there is not metal polymer residue or oxide polymer residue in the contact opening.

Jin et al. does not specifically show removing the residues by applying nitric acid and phosphoric acid. However, Wilson et al. shows that the use of nitric acid and phosphoric acid for the removing of residues is well known in the art (col. 4, lines 35-38).

Furthermore, product-by-process claims are limited and defined by the process; determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by

process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process. *In re Hirao and Sato et al.*, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (CCPA 1976) (footnote 3). See also *IN re Brown and Saffer*, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972); *In re Luck and Gainer*, 177 USPQ 523 (CCPA 1973); *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1974); *In re Marosi et al.*, 218 USPQ 289 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to recognize that the structure taught by Jin et al. would correspond with the structure claimed because there is not evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 798, 802, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed March 30, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claims 1-6 and 8-9 stand rejected because there is not evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 798, 802, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Applicant argued that the combination of Jin et al. and Wilson et al. fails to teach an opening in a dielectric layer having substantially parallel sidewalls. However, Jin et al. shows a contact opening in a dielectric layer extending from an upper surface of the dielectric layer to a substantially damage free metal-containing conductive pad having

substantially parallel sidewalls (Fig. 8, col. 7, lines 29-31, 45-62, col. 8, lines 25-30, col. 10, lines 5-12).

Applicant argued that the combination of Jin et al. and Wilson et al. fails to teach all claim limitations. However, the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process. *In re Hirao and Sato et al.*, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (CCPA 1976 (footnote 3). See also *IN re Brown and Saffer*, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972); *In re Luck and Gainer*, 177 USPQ 523 (CCPA 1973); *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1974); *In re Marosi et al.*, 218 USPQ 289 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Applicant argued that Jin fails to teach or suggest the substantially damage free metal containing conductive pad because Jin acknowledges the main etch and overetch may induce charging damage. However, Jin et al. also teaches limiting the dry etch time to avoid the charging damage and producing excellent reliability (Fig. 8, col. 2, lines 55-65, col. 7, lines 45-62, col. 8, lines 25-30, col. 10, lines 5-12). Therefore, the metal-containing conductive pad taught by Jin et al. is substantially free of charging damage.

The Patent Office bears a lesser burden of proof in making out a case of *prima facie obviousness for product-by-process claims because of their peculiar nature*" than when a product is claimed in the conventional fashion. *In re Fessmann*, 489 F.2d 742, 744, 180 USPQ 324, 326 (CCPA 1974). Once the examiner provides a rationale tending to show that the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of the prior

art, although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 798, 802, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Furthermore, the lack of physical description in a product-by-process claim makes determination of the patentability of the claim more difficult, since in spite of the fact that the claim may recite only process limitations, it is the patentability of the product claimed and not of the recited process steps, which must be established. We are therefore of the opinion that when the prior art discloses a product which reasonably appears to be either identical with or only slightly different than a product claimed in a product-by-process claim, a rejection based alternatively on either section 102 or section 103 of the statute is eminently fair and acceptable. As a practical matter, the Patent Office is not equipped to manufacture products by the myriad of processes put before it and then obtain prior art products and make physical comparisons therewith." *In re Brown*, 459 F.2d 531, 535, 173 USPQ 685, 688 (CCPA 1972). Legal precedent can provide the rationale supporting obviousness only if the facts in the case are sufficiently similar to those in the application. If the facts in a prior legal decision are sufficiently similar to those in an application under examination, the examiner may use the rationale used by the court.

In addition, during patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." > *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). While the claims of issued

patents are interpreted in light of the specification, prosecution history, prior art and other claims, this is not the mode of claim interpretation to be applied during examination. During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. > In re American Academy of Science Tech Center, F.3d , 2004 WL 1067528 (Fed. Cir. May 13, 2004)(The USPTO uses a different standard for construing claims than that used by district courts; during examination the USPTO must give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation.) < This means that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless applicant has provided a clear definition in the specification. In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) >; Chef America, Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc., 358 F.3d 1371, 1372, 69 USPQ2d 1857 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maria Guerrero whose telephone number is 571-272-1837.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amir Zarabian can be reached on 571-272-1852. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 2, 2005

Maria Guerrero
MARIA F. GUERRERO
PRIMARY EXAMINER